

No. 5:09-CV-205-D

Plaintiff,

V.

Defendants.

Case 5:09-cv-00205-D Document 443 Filed 02/16/11 Page 1 of 2

outweigh the public interests in access,’ and ‘[t]he party seeking to overcome the presumption bears the burden of showing some significant interest that outweighs the presumption.’” Id. (alteration in original) (quoting Rushford v. New Yorker Magazine, Inc., 846F.2d 249, 253 (4th Cir. 1988)). Furthermore, the court is obligated to consider less drastic alternatives to sealing, and where a court decides to seal documents, it must “state the reasons for its decision to seal supported by specific findings, and the reasons for rejecting alternatives to sealing in order to provide an adequate record for review.” In re Knight Publ’g Co., 743 F.2d 231, 235 (4th Cir. 1984).

The document in question [D.E. 392] does not contain confidential business information or other materials subject to trade secret protection. The motion to seal [D.E. 395] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED. This 16 day of February 2011.


JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge